DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 988 HE 007 791

AUTHOR Blackburn, Robert T.; Peterson, Marvin W.
TITLE Administrator and Faculty Responses to Increased Black Enrollment in White Universities.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE [76]
GRANT MH-23770-02
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Bibliographies; Comparative Analysis; Enrollment Rate; *Higher Education; *Minority Groups; *Negro Students; *Teacher Attitudes; Universities

ABSTRACT

One-hundred forty-one administrators (70.1 percent return) and 363 faculty (54.4 percent return) in four universities responded on their attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors with respect to the impact a rapidly increased black enrollment had on their institution. Factor analyses produced indices for within and between group comparisons. Using F and t tests, principal findings were: (1) overall similarity between administrators and faculty on most variables; (2) within administrative subgroups differences by function, but not by level; and (3) faculty subgroup differences by age and discipline. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123988

HE

ADMINISTRATOR AND FACULTY RESPONSES TO INCREASED BLACK ENROLLMENT IN WHITE UNIVERSITIES*

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert T. Blackburn

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 007 791

Robert T. Blackburn
Professor of Higher Education

Marvin W. Peterson
Associate Professor of Higher Education and
Faculty Associate, Institute for Social Research

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor

*This paper is adapted from a part of Chapter 7 in a forthcoming book, Colleges and Changing Clientele: The Impact and Response of White Institutions to Black Enrollment Increases, by Marvin W. Peterson, et al. The research was supported by an NIMH grant (MH 23770-02).

Administrator and Faculty Responses to Increased Black Enrollment in White Universities

ABSTRACT

One-hundred forty-one (141) administrators (70.1% return) and 363 faculty (54.4% return) in four universities responded on their attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors with respect to the impact a rapidly increased black enrollment had on their institution. Factor analyses produced indices for within and between group comparisons. Using F and t tests, principal findings were: (1) overall similiarity between administrators and faculty on most variables; (2) within administrative subgroups differences by function, but not by level; and (3) faculty subgroup differences by age and discipline.

Introduction

Among the many consequences of the civil rights movement, the late 1960's saw the accelerated enrollment of blacks in some colleges and universities. When the increase in numbers was appreciable and took place in a short period of time, the new clientele impacted on the institutions. As human organizations whose products, processes, and raw materials are primarily people-related, college and university structures and processes had to be affected both socially and academically. Decisions had to be made with respect to living accommodations as well as whether or not to launch separate or integrated academic programs. The organization's maintenance, productive, and adaptive functions were impacted upon whether the increased minority presence involved conflict or not. In short, colleges and universities which responded positively to a most important human problem simultaneously provided a laboratory for the investigation of organizational impact. The findings reported here are selected faculty and administrator responses to increased black enrollment and represent one segment of a larger inquiry.*

---

*This paper is adapted from a part of Chapter 7 in a forthcoming book, Colleges and Changing Clientele: The Impact and Response of White Institutions to Black Enrollment Increases, by Marvin W. Peterson, et al. The research was supported by an NIMH grant (MH 23770-02).

Conceptual Framework and the Research Questions

Although this was an exploratory study, the design derives from a theoretical framework for analyzing institutions. We view institutions of higher education as complex organizations which must deal with certain internal and external problems. Internally, colleges and universities must provide conditions so that the subgroups which keep it going--faculty members, administrators, students--can continue to perform institutional tasks. Externally, they must deal with threatening and supportive groups in such a way as to both maximize institutional integrity and institutional responsiveness. Structures and processes develop in organizations to deal with these issues. In a setting as large and diverse as a complex university, it is impossible to understand its workings as an undifferentiated conglomerate of people. Rather, the need is to identify the regular patterns of behavior (processes) and the regular relationships of positions and processes (structure) that enable the university to function as an organized entity which accomplishes certain purposes.

The activities and interactions of students, faculty, staff, and administrators constitute patterns of behavior that describe the university's varying processes--teaching, research, admissions, placement, decision-making, communication, conflict resolution, etc. The processes themselves lead to certain functional (or dysfunctional) outcomes such as producing degrees and research (productive); allocating resources and evaluating effectiveness (managerial); limiting the stress on or providing rewards to human beings (maintenance); maintaining external relations (boundary); and adapting to new realities or planning (adaptive). These processes and their results are determined in part by the human, physical, and informational resources the university obtains from its environment and by the influence of external power groups and organizations.

The formal organization is the formally approved set of positions, committees, and programs (the organization chart) and the goals, policies, rules, and regulations by which they are related. All of these act to control the pattern of individual behavior, the requisite skills for various positions, and the patterns of interactions with other persons whether they are students, faculty, or administrators. The social organization refers to the informal groups of people that emerge in any organization based on personal needs, motives, expectations, values, and interests. These groups often develop attitudes toward their work (sentiments) and/or patterns of behavior (norms) that may or may not be consistent with the patterns required by the formal organization. Finally, the technology of an organization refers to the physical mechanisms and techniques utilized. In a university the kinds of teaching resource materials, the kind of budget format, or the mode of information handling are examples.

All three of these subsystems, the formal, social, and technological, obviously are affected by the kinds of inputs the university receives and, in turn, they affect the way people behave and the manner in which the processes (behavioral patterns) contribute to functional outcomes. What is less obvious, but widely recognized by social and organizational theorists, is that changing any of the subsystems is likely to affect the others.

In this study the major change is in the human input--the introduction of black students with new characteristics, abilities, expectations, and needs. In the past, institutions of higher education, particularly the most selective schools, could count on a fairly close match between college and students. What happens, as with the recent inclusion of minority groups in higher education, when high selectivity and matching between students and institution are no longer possible? Of course, not all colleges and universities in the U.S. are faced with this question: some have chosen--or have not yet had demands

made on them--not to enroll significantly increased numbers of minority students. Others, among them the most prestigious private colleges in the country, have been able to find minority students from the top ability and social class strata. But many colleges and universities have had to wrestle more painfully with the problem. What have they done? How have roles changed? Do all constituencies view the phenomenon alike? Share the same values? Have the same goals? These and related questions derive from our conceptual view of the university as a complex organization.

Setting, Population, and Instruments

After research team visits to 13 mid-west and mid-east colleges and universities ascertained what had transpired between 1968 and 1972 when black enrollment more than doubled, four universities were selected for survey analysis in Spring, 1975. The universities differed in type of control (three public, one private), complexity (mostly undergraduate to full research and Ph.D. activity), size (8,000-20,000), student selectivity (open admissions to high SATs), and ecology (rural to large, urban). An extensive, pretested questionnaire obtained responses on perceptions of institutional goals for minorities (A, F)*; the responding individual's goals with regard to blacks (A,F);

---

*Questionnaire sections were sometimes identical for all constituencies--administrators (A), faculty (F), and students (S), sometimes for two of the three groups, as in the case just asterisked; and sometimes unique to a group.

---

perceptions of the university's racial climate (A,F,S); support for minority efforts (S); minority student needs (S); the institution's responsiveness and effectiveness to minority students (A,F,S); black student impact on the

university (A,F); future concerns (A,F,S); and black student impact on individuals (A,F, and S, although different question sets for each group).

The student group consisted of all black undergraduates and a random sample of white students equal in number to the black population, all arts and science faculty, and all administrators with an assistant director and/or dean or higher title. Student response rates were too low to permit reliable analyses. Returns from administrators and faculty were 70.1 and 54.4 percent, respectively (Faculty N = 363 ; Administrator N = 141). Factor analysis was used for data reduction and index construction. F and t tests were used for the comparisons reported here.

Findings

I. Faculty Responses: Rank, Sex, and Department

In general, faculty responses show a positive ideology, intent, and actual behavior vis-a-vis minority issues. This overwhelmingly white group expresses concern about the access and success of minority students in colleges and universities, including their own. Their average index scores consistently show "moderate" values and actions, on the "liberal" rather than the "conservative" side.

For example, with respect to their views of the role of racial minorities in colleges and universities, faculty (and so do administrators even more positively--see Section II and III below) believe they have a social commitment to minority issues, that the entrance of minorities into their university will be healthful in the long run, and that segregation is not desired. They have some questions about such matters as activism, open admissions, and performance standards. However, the overall tone is one which is in accord with the hopes and aspirations of the new clientele.

Similarly, while there are some differences between the four institutions participating in the survey on perceptions of their university's goals for blacks, again a moderate to positive response prevails toward such objectives as strong black and/or ethnic studies programs and the recruitment and hiring of minority faculty and administrators. While faculty express a personal commitment to altruistic goals and believe that their institutions have shown real signs of concern, they remain critical on a number of points. For example, they say that their university's response to blacks has been less than adequate. Faculty are sensitive to the impacts that increased black enrollments have had on departmental matters, but most state that their professional lives have not been altered in profound ways.

Despite this overall moderate to liberal response, subgroup differences occur. Comparisons by rank, sex, and academic department give insights into the range of faculty behavior and help illuminate a university's variations and complexities.

A. Rank

Academic rank carries status and influence in academic communities when it comes to matters of governance, program approval, recruitment, hiring, and promotion. In addition, rank as a variable is a proxy for age and for tenure. Therefore, differences between full and associate professors (older, tenured, and more powerful) and assistant professors and instructors (younger, less secure, and with little influence) can be expected. Furthermore, the comparisons give insights into the internal dynamics of an institution.

All four ranks perceived the four institutional goal indices essentially alike. Also, two of the three role indices had insignificant F scores. Only the long-term minority impact index was judged differently ($p < .01$) by faculty in different ranks. Here, in a steady progression through the ranks, the

older and more seasoned full professors saw the long-term minority impact to be significantly less than each of the other three groups. The full professors did not view it to be inconsequential; however, they did not see the long-term impact of minorities to be as great as instructors did.

[Insert Table 1 about here.]

On the other hand, three of the four racial climate indices and all seven of the institutional responsiveness indices generate F ratios large enough for p values of .05 or less. With the exception of only one other index--authoritarian treatment, i.e., the tendency for black issues, in contrast to other university issues, to be dealt with in a more closed fashion and for decisions on black issues and their implementation to come from the top down--there are no differences between ranks. With regard to their view of future institutional commitments to minorities, and a host of activities that deal with instruction, curriculum, and governance matters, instructors and all three professorial ranks reply essentially the same way.

When statistically significant differences do occur (Table 1), the pattern is a highly consistent one either up or down the ranks. That is, with some slight exceptions, full professors and instructors are on opposite ends with their responses and the two intermediate ranks in between and in progression. Some inferences seem to follow from this data and give a first glimpse of faculty internal dynamics vis-a-vis the new clientele they face.

First, the outcomes seem to be less a consequence of the manifest variables of status (rank) and security (tenure for associate and full professors) than they are of the correlated latent characteristics of age and years in the profession. On this basis, older and more experienced academics see events differently than do the younger novitiates. The older faculty are probably more

removed from conflicts which took place and from direct interaction with minority students. The senior members give high, positive credit to their institution's responses, its willingness, and the commitment of all constituencies. They see high positive interaction. At the same time, from their greater experience, they do not appear to expect the long-run impact of this phenomenon to be as great as do those who are more directly involved and who have less of an actual history in higher education. Their experience and positions of power in university governance also have older faculty judge black entry to be more administratively dominated and dealt with outside of faculty involvement than are other events which affect the university.

Younger faculty answers are consistent with this interpretation based upon age. Being more idealistic and directly involved, they see the inadequacies of the university response. They personally think blacks have an impact, one that will last. They are doubtful that the necessary commitments for the successful treatment of the new clientele are as strong as they need to be.

Second, the aberrations in the patterns tend to occur within the associate professor group. As studied by Schuman and Laumann (1967), Blackburn (1972), and Sherman (1973) have demonstrated, faculty at this career stage sometimes display more conservative characteristics than do their colleagues in the ranks above or below them, or, for that matter, than they will themselves show once they are promoted to full professor. Associate professors possess the fewest career options; they recognize that they must first earn promotion at home. Associate professors are especially sensitive to the internal power of the organization and exhibit a good company-like behavior, one they had not had before achieving this rank and one they will not again have after leaving it. For example, the associate professors respond lower than either full or assistant professors on black/white trust but higher than these two groups on black visibility and influence.

Third, when matters come closer to the faculty roles of teaching, evaluating students, course content, demands on time, and the like, age matters very little. In these areas of day-to-day job performance, the effects are the same on all. Faculty assert that their teaching techniques and evaluation practices are the same for black as for white students, that the new clientele has increased the time they give to teaching, counseling, and other instructional matters, and that this additional time has come from a slighting of scholarly work. In addition, minority issues have affected departmental hiring and promotion matters, but the overall impact has been between "very little" and "somewhat," so faculty at all ranks say.

In summary, then, age and experience are factors which do distinguish faculty perceptions, especially on how the university responded to black issues, on what the current racial climate is on campus, how such issues are dealt with, and what their long-range impact will be. At the same time, when it comes to day-to-day behavior on the job--teaching, departmental governance, and the like--age (rank) does not seem to matter.

B. Sex Differences

Differences between female and male faculty are pronounced most by their absence. In only three instances do F ratios exceed the .05 level. (See Table 2.) Two of these--long-term minority impact and authoritarian treatment--

[Insert Table 2 about here.]

are the same ones that occurred above in the comparisons by rank. In fact, those two may well be a function of the same latent factor that operated there, viz., age. Women are both newer to academic posts and not distributed across ranks in the way men are but are more concentrated in the lower echelons. That is, the differences just noted may be much more a function of age than of sex.

As for the sex difference with respect to departmental black concerns goes, what may be in operation here is the more inclusive issue of affirmative action, i.e., the hiring of women as well as minorities. Women may see blacks as competitors for a diminishing set of new staff openings in the department. Our data, however, do not allow a definitive explanation for this particular difference.

While studies on female faculty have been numerous the past few years, most have concentrated on discrimination, especially with respect to salary and promotion. Another large body of research has examined female and male scholarly productivity, a factor not likely to be operative in the domain under consideration here. Differences in interest in teaching and research have appeared (see, for example, Behyme- (1974)).

However, comparisons of a kind which might be expected to affect responses to the concerns of this study have not been made. Very little research exists in the area of values which might show sex differences. To the extent that only black-white issues are at stake, we have neither prior evidence or strong reason to anticipate major sex differences. And, essentially, no differences are what resulted.

C. Department and/or Discipline Differences

On the basis of the nature of different disciplines--the kinds of problems they deal with, the methodologies they employ, and the products they produce, to mention but three--people are differentially attracted to fields of study and socialized into the academic profession in graduate schools and on the job. It is not surprising, then, that values between academic units differ. Extensive research documents attitudinal and value differences. For example, discipline differences have been shown to exist with respect to faculty attitudes toward students (Wilson and Gaff, 1975), political and social issues (Ladd

and Lipset, 1973), collective bargaining (Garbarino, 1975), and a number of other factors.

As was stated above, while faculty from many units were surveyed, a special effort was made to increase the response rate in nine arts and science departments--two in the humanities (English and history), three in the natural sciences (biology, chemistry, and mathematics), and four in the social sciences (economics, political science, psychology, and sociology). It is comparisons of these nine departments which are displayed below.

Table 3 displays the means, F ratio, and the between department differences which are significant on the seven indices and three items which have $p < .05$ (one exception, the black visibility and influence indice has $p=.07$ but is included). Some interesting patterns begin to emerge.

[Insert Table 3 about here.]

Note that mathematics has the highest mean on four of the seven, is second on two others, and is third on the remaining one. At the other extreme are the sociologists, lowest on six of the seven and second from the bottom on the remaining one. Note next that biology, another natural science, ranks high (first, second and third) on the first three indices, intermediate on the fourth, and then eighth of nine on the last three. Psychology, a second social science, follows a mirror image pattern, being second from the bottom with sociology on the first four (that is, with low means), intermediate on the fifth, and at the top on two of the last three and third on the last. Said another way, a second natural and social science start out like their respective companions of mathematics and sociology but replace one another on the last three indices, psychology now being close to mathematics and biology next to sociology.

At the extremes, it appears as if the mathematicians are idealists. They find goals, climate, impact, adequacy of response, commitment, and influence

high without exception while simultaneously stating that the presence of blacks has not altered their courses and their departments. Mathematics is mathematics and has no racial dimension, these faculty seem to say, and, since few blacks major in math, the departmental concern is comparatively low. On the opposite end, sociologists, the faculty whose expertise includes racial issues, express a more realistic and skeptical view. They do not see integration as the goal, are most reserved about the health of the campus climate, rate the impact low, judge the institution's response to be the least adequate, and, furthermore, score commitment lowest. Their courses are affected somewhat, and so are departmental concerns. However, the degree is not as high as it is for the humanists. The English faculty probably are confronting issues of the inclusion of black authors in literature courses and dealing with student writing problems resulting from less than adequate prior instruction. Similarly, historians now must reorganize the traditional western civilization course when black history is called for.

As for the biologists, they value integration and perceive a healthy climate. Like the mathematicians, biologists have less instructional contact with black students. However, when it comes to their own view of the adequacy of the institution's response and to commitments subgroups have made, biologists find them comparatively weaker. Why this difference occurs is not clear from the data. Perhaps biological faculty employ their scientific side in the former category but utilize their people conceptual apparatus and seem to behave like the sociologists in the latter.

Research on faculty frequently shows disciplinary differences on a number of behavior variables--political liberalism vs. conservatism (Lipset and Ladd,

1971), productivity (Fulton and Trow, 1974), and others.* However, only a

*Some of the better research pieces establishing faculty disciplinary differences along a number of dimensions are Vreeland and Bidwell (1966), Friedman (1967), Spaulding and Turner (1968), Kelly and Hart (1971), Peters (1971), and Centra (1975).

few studies have investigated faculty-student interactions. Gamson (1966), for example, found social science faculty much more involved with all of a student's problems, not just her or his course and/or intellectual ones, whereas science faculty tended to keep students more at an arm's length and saw their principal relationships with students as persons to whom they transmit a specialized body of knowledge and a set of rational skills. Her findings are consistent with the low scores biologists report when it comes to black impact on their courses and their departments. Like the mathematicians, these natural scientists are asserting that even biology is biology and is not much influenced by race.**

**Other research on faculty-student relations shows field and/or discipline differences. For example, Astin (1965) found three bipolar factors along psychological characteristics. Blackburn and Lindquist (1971) uncovered faculty trust of students to differ by field of specialization, a result similar to Wilson et al. (1975) with regard to permissions faculty are willing to extend to students. Krathwohl (1960), Feinberg (1968), Thielens (1970), Snow (1973), and Bayer (1975) also report data which confirm discipline differences. However, no research has been reported on departmental differences for black students and white faculty, a matter of high importance.

Last, the psychologists, kin to the sociologists in the matter of goals and climate, switch to a personal framework from a societal one on the commitment indices. Psychologists are saying that their personal commitment (and students and blacks, as well) is high. They care and believe others also do. Along the commitment indices, they express the same idealism the mathematicians do.

Faculty, then, are not all alike in their viewpoints, beliefs, perceptions, and presumably, in their behaviors vis-a-vis black students. In addition, individual variation, which, of course, occurs within individual departments, also is related to academic disciplines. Blacks will not find all faculty reacting the same way toward them. Furthermore, entire departments have behaviors that distinguish one from another.*

---

*How such differences may be related to disciplines blacks tend to specialize in and/or choose electives in are important questions. Unfortunately, they go beyond the scope of this study. Our data do not permit answers to these questions.

II. Administrative Responses

In general, administrators demonstrate essentially the same moderate to liberal social values faculty do, even a bit more strongly (see below). While individual variation exists, on the average administrators respond with concern for black-related issues and believe that they and their institution have given a positive reply to an important social matter. In the main, administrator views parallel those of faculty and the differences are more ones of degree than they are of kind. (See below for administrator-faculty differences.)

Nonetheless, within the administrative structure, subgroups can exist.* Both their similarities and differences are revealing.

*Because of the smaller administrative N, fewer group comparisons are possible than was the case within the faculty sample.

A. By Appointment Level

From a "room-at-the-top" perspective, one might expect those at different administrative levels to both value and view any black issue differently. The nature of the problems chief executive officers have to deal with--say, trustee and/or legislator questions regarding who is running the university--presumably are different in kind from the problems assistant or associate personnel confront on a day-to-day basis--like lounge space or security staff accused of racism.

The sample size made possible comparisons between mean scores of administrators at three levels of appointment: (1) executive officers (presidents and vice-presidents), (2) deans and directors, and (3) assistants and associates to individuals in the first two categories. The principal finding from these analyses is the lack of significant differences between administrative levels. On only one index did the F value reach a significance value less than .05, a result which by itself would be expected to happen by chance alone when comparisons are made on twenty-nine (29) variables. In fact, the similarities between the administrative hierarchies are so great that only one other p value was below .25, and that was .24. Heirarchies may exist, and values and perceptions may differ up and down an organizational ladder, but in these universities, administrative stratification exists only in titles and functions, not in beliefs and views. These organizations gave a highly unified set of responses

when vertical analyses were undertaken. Within the administrative cohort, bureaucracy is not visible on goals and commitments to minorities.

B. By Administrative Area of Appointment

Reclassifying the administrative respondents by four areas of appointment--(1) academic affairs, (2) business or finance, (3) student affairs, and (4) black/minority affairs--yielded quite a different picture. Over half of the indices were significant at or less than the .05 level and eleven of these at less than the .01 level. Table 4 shows the mean indice scores, F values, and significance levels.

[Insert Table 4 about here.]

Without displaying t tests between the administrative categories, inspection reveals that it is the black/minority affairs personnel who are always farthest away from the other three groups. In addition, in almost every case, it is the business/finance group which is at the other pole, high on an index in some instances, low on others. To the extent that there is an additional consistency to the pattern, more often than not academic affairs is closer to business/finance and student affairs leans toward black/minority affairs. Again, though, the atypical group is black/minority affairs.

Moreover, Table 4 reveals more than statistical subgroup differences. It shows that those who work in the black/minority area--and this is where the highest proportion of black administrators reside--and, it is safe to assume, where whites who are most sympathetic to black goals are most likely to be found--perceive the rapid increase of black student enrollment appreciably differently from their colleagues in other administrative offices. Those in minority affairs see the long-term impact to be much greater than does the average individual in the other appointment areas. At the same time, the

minority office staff view the racial climate to be considerably less favorable than do the others. They see less black/white trust, less black visibility, less openness to problems, less interaction between campus groups. In addition, the minority affairs personnel view the institution's response to black student entry as the least adequate, and they judge the willingness and commitments of all whites--administrators, faculty, and students--to be the weakest. In fact, black/minority area staff see black influence to be much less than all others. (The last four indices in Impacts and Responses--Administrative category reflect the same perspective.)

While it is understandable that those who are most intimately involved in a cause, as those in black/minority affairs obviously are, will tend to have more extreme views (and in the direction found in each instance in Table 4), it is not equally apparent why those in business and financial roles reside at the other extreme. Some understanding is achieved by noting a couple of relevant and related factors. First, increased black enrollment entailed an appreciable rise in financial aid. While often the funds largely were externally supplied, the amount of bookkeeping and energy in financial aid offices rose rapidly. Large numbers of previously unhandled dollars were now processed, and not always smoothly despite the good intentions of those involved. Most of these dollars went to blacks, millions of dollars, in fact. Furthermore, the money was secured and dispersed only after considerable effort and difficulties. From this perspective of activity and effort, it is not too surprising that financial administrators see a strong institutional response.

Second, not infrequently individuals in business/finance are most removed from "the life of academe." They are less likely to have been faculty than are those administrators now in, say, academic affairs offices. Business officers are more apt to have closer relationships with bankers and merchants

in town than they are with people in either student or academic affairs. If some biases exist in town, especially racial but also vis-a-vis students in general, business personnel will quickly hear the remarks.

In summary, then, the numerous differences that exist between administrative areas but which do not exist in analyses by level of appointment suggest that black administrators (and whites who have similar aims and values) are dispersed vertically throughout the organization even though they are segregated by functional areas. The average response at all administrative levels is much the same. Attitudes and beliefs, however, differ from one administrative area to another.

III. Administrator/Faculty Comparisons

While the general posture of faculty and administrators toward the larger issue of blacks in higher education has been described as being similar, viz., concerned, responsive, and committed, there remains the question of possible differences between the two populations. Long-run success and goal accomplishment require that these two constituencies hold basically identical positions for either group by itself most likely could not succeed without the endorsement and support of the other. At the same time, we know that most universities have the typical "we-they" schism between faculty and administration.* The

*The literature is extensive on administrative-faculty relations. However, most is essayistic and without empirical data. Niland (1964) and Lutes (1972) have studies in this area. Even they, however, do not answer the questions raised here.

gap's width varies from college to college and sometimes is more rhetorical than substantive. Nonetheless, more often than not, differences of opinion and ideas

for action can surface on sensitive issues.

Table 5 shows that on several indices statistically significant administrative-faculty differences exist--on role, goals, institutional responsiveness, and impact on the institution. However, for the most part the differences are ones of degree, although a few separations indicate that the two subgroups have different interpretations and/or priorities. For example, in each instance administrators have higher scores on all four goal indices.

[Insert Table 5 about here.]

That is, administrators more strongly endorse integration, affirmative action, financial support, and their university's high priority vis-a-vis blacks. (Remember, though, that faculty also subscribe to these same goals. The differences here are ones of intensity, not of one constituency for and the other against.) Administrators also see impact and commitment to have been stronger than faculty perceive. (Administrators also score faculty commitment higher than faculty themselves do, but the difference did not reach statistical significance.) As administrators strive to achieve the goals they have set, they believe particularistic standards may be necessary, an issue on which faculty disagree. Finally, despite the number of indices which show a more active administrative concern and level of activity, the administrative group declares their university's response to be less adequate than faculty say it is.

Additional evidence supports the stronger stand administrators take. The data are collected in Table 6. These are items from the first section of the questionnaire for all constituencies and deal with the role of racial minorities in colleges and universities. They constitute eight of the twelve items not used in any indice and all that reached a p level of .05 or less.

[Insert Table 6 about here.]

While the tendency to agree or disagree continues to show the basic concordance between administrators and faculty, in every case administrators take the stronger position with respect to minority concerns. Administrators advocate a more activist stance (items 7, 9, and 10) and particularistic practices (items 12, 14, 15, 19, and 20) than faculty do. When a position is favored, administrators express a higher level of agreement; when a position receives a disagree vote, administrators disagree less strongly; and when there is a genuine difference as to agreement or disagreement, administrators come out on the minority side.

Most often the decision to take a strong position toward increasing black enrollments was made at the top. (See the last index in Table 5. Even administrators admit this fact, one that normally is contrary to the collegial form of governance these institutions espouse.) Once a decision has been made and the necessary machinery set into action, administrators act to accomplish the goals they set. They give the support and loyalty an organization needs to function smoothly. On the other hand, although they are often accused of being so, faculty are not really less loyal. Rather, faculty tend to have multiple loyalties. They are likely to identify with professional dsiciplinary societies which transcend any particular university's boundaries as well as with their departments and schools. Furthermore, faculty endorse a set of professional canons of conduct, including the right and duty to criticize in public the employing organization. "The university right or wrong" will not be subscribed to by faculty to the same extent that it will be by administrators, especially by nonacademic ones.

In the main, the data show this faculty-administrative division. For the issue of increased black enrollment, however, administrators can know the faculty are behind them, figuratively and literally. The chief point of

contention hinges around standards. Traditionally, faculty have subscribed to universalistic performance criteria, ones that are independent of secondary characteristics. It is the product that is to be judged, and it is the product alone, regardless of the maker. Supposedly administrators also hold these performance values. However, in the case of black enrollments (whether for admissions, course success, or retention), administrators opt for the need of individualistic considerations.

We saw no signs that this difference was a crucial stumbling block on any campus we visited. Overall high agreement prevails between administrators and faculty. If goal accomplishment were singly dependent upon this harmony, success would be assured.

Discussion

Other data (not reported here) reveal that few differences exist between the universities on items and indices. The response similarity across institutions is the major outcome. Homogeneity results despite the varied nature of the pressures the institutions faced, the different kind of programs they developed, the diversity of university types in the sample, and the independence of the institutions from one another. Hence, while one cannot generalize from a non-random sample of four, the evidence indicates that the findings may be generally true.

The principal individual findings just reported with respect to faculty age and discipline and to administrative area show that the rapid increase in black enrollment had a greater impact on processes and structures than it did on individual role behavior, administrator or faculty. Related research now in progress is attempting to relate individual characteristics with faculty

attitudes and behavior. Similar studies need to be launched with respect to administrators.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W. Classroom environment in different field of study. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1965, 56, 275-283.

Bayer, A. E. Faculty composition, institutional structure, and students' college environment. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46, 5, 549-565.

Behymer, Jr., C. E. Institutional and personal correlates of faculty productivity. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1974.

Blackburn, R. T. and Lindquist, J. D. Faculty behavior in the legislative process: Professorial attitudes vs. behavior concerning the inclusion of students in academic decision-making. Sociology of Education, 1971, 44, 398-421.

Blackburn, R. T. Tenure: Aspects of Job Security on the Changing Campus. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, Research Monograph No. 19, 1972.

Centra, J. A. Colleagues as raters of classroom instruction. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46, 1, 327-337.

Feinberg, L. H. Relationships between college students' behavior and attitudes toward student-faculty contact. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1968.

Friedman, N. L. The subject matterist orientation toward field of academic orientation. The American Sociologist, 1967, 2, 1, 12-15.

Fulton, O. and Trow, M. Research activity in American higher education. Sociology of Education, 1974, 47, 29-73.

Gamson, Z. F. Utilitarian and normative orientations toward education. Sociology of Education, 1966, 39, 46-73.

Garbarino, J. W. Faculty Bargaining. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Kelly, R. and Hart, B. D. Role performances of faculty in different age groups and academic disciplines. Sociology of Education, 1971, 44, 351-357.

Krathwohl, C. L. A study of student-instructor relationship at the college level. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1960.

Ladd, Jr., E. C. and Lipset, S. M. Academics, Politics, and the 1972 Election. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1973.

Lipset, S. and Ladd, Jr., E. C. The Divided Professoriate. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Lutes, R. D. Personal variables of university faculty members as related to their perception of the leader behavior of an administrator. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1972.

Niland, W. P. Faculty-administration conflict in California public junior colleges: An analysis and a proposal for resolution. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.

Peters, D. S. Of time and the pronoun. California Journal of Educational Research, 1971, 22, 115-121.

Schuman, H. and Laumann, E. O. Do most professors support the war? Trans-action, Nov., 1967, 5, 32-35.

Sherman, B. R. Effectiveness of college teachers as a function of faculty characteristics and student perception. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1973.

Snow, S. G. Correlates of faculty-student interaction. Sociology of Education, 1973, 46, 489-498.

Spaulding, C. B. and Turner, H. A. Political orientation and field of specialization among college professors. Sociology of Education, 1968, 41, 3, 245-262

Thielens, Jr., W. The teacher-student relationship in the college classroom. Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1970 (mimeographed).

Vreeland, R. S. and Bidwell, C. D. Classifying university departments: An approach to the analysis of their effects upon undergraduates' values and attitudes. Sociology of Education, 1966, 39, 237-254.

Wilson, R. C., Gaff, J. G., Dienst, E. R., Wood, L. and Bavey, J. L. College Professors and Their Impact on Students. New York: Wiley, 1975.

TABLES 1 - 6

TABLE 1

FACULTY DIFFERENCES AS RELATED TO ACADEMIC RANK:
INDICE SCORES, F VALUE, AND p LEVEL

Indice	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor	F	p
Role						
Long term minority impact	6.68	6.92	7.11	7.33	3.62	.01
Climate						
Black/White trust	9.26	8.74	8.89	8.50	2.82	.04
Openness and inclusiveness	9.18	9.10	8.70	8.67	2.64	.05
Black visibility and influence	7.93	8.40	7.62	7.36	4.39	< .01
Institutional Responsiveness						
Willingness	21.04	20.85	20.42	18.86	8.70	< .01
Adequacy	16.17	15.43	15.17	14.24	4.73	< .01
White commitment to Black	31.71	31.28	30.01	28.64	8.41	< .01
Administrative commitment	16.60	16.45	15.55	14.62	10.87	< .01
Faculty commitment	12.12	12.08	11.70	11.33	3.79	.01
Student commitment	7.44	7.18	7.07	6.86	4.21	< .01
Black commitment	8.74	8.67	8.46	8.22	2.77	.04
Impact						
Authoritarianism	10.77	10.44	9.90	9.64	10.27	< .01

TABLE 2

FACULTY DIFFERENCES AS RELATED TO SEX:
INDICE AND ITEM SCORES, F VALUE, AND P LEVEL

Indices and Items	Sex		F	p
	Female	Male		
Role				
Long term minority impact	7.32	6.87	6.37	.01
Impact				
Authoritarianism	9.85	10.39	6.76	.01
Departmental Black Concerns	5.04	4.66	7.08	.01

TABLE 3

DEPARTMENTAL RANK ORDERS ON INDICES AND ITEMS WHERE DIFFERENCES ARE STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT, AND DEPARTMENT DIFFERENCES

	Goal	Climate		Impact	Institutional Responsiveness			Items		
	Integrating Concern for Blacks	Adm/Fac/ Student Interaction	Black Visibility and Influence	Total Black Influence	Faculty Commitment	Student Commitment	Black Commitment	Faculty & Admin. Influence	Black Course Content	Dept. Black Concerns
Rank Order	Biology Math Chem History Pol Sci English Econ Psych Soc	Math Biology Chem History Pol Sci Econ English Psych Soc	Math History Biology Chem Pol Sci English Psych Soc Econ	Math Chem Biology History Econ Pol Sci English Psych Soc	Psych History Math English* Pol Sci* Econ Biology Chem Soc	Psych Math Econ Pol Sci History Chem English* Biology* Soc	Math Psych English* History* Pol Sci Econ Chem Soc Biology	Econ Biology Pol Sci Math Chem Soc Psych History English	History English Psych Soc Pol Sci Econ Biology Chem Math	History English Econ Pol Sci Psych Soc Math Biology Chem
F	.04	.03	.07	.02	03	.02	.01	.01	.02	.01
	Hist vs Psych Hist vs Soc Bio vs Psych Chem vs Psych Chem vs Soc Math vs Psych Math vs Soc	Math vs Eng Math vs Pol Sci Math vs Psych Math vs Soc Hist vs Soc Biol vs Soc Chem vs Soc	Math vs English Math vs Soc Math vs Psych Math vs Eng Hist vs Soc Hist vs Psych	Math vs Psych Math vs Soc Chem vs Soc Biol vs Soc Hist vs Soc Econ vs Soc Pol Sci vs Soc Eng vs Soc	Psych vs Biology Psych vs Chem Psych vs Soc Hist vs Chem Hist vs Soc Math vs Soc Eng vs Soc Pol Sci vs Soc Econ vs Soc	Psych vs Hist Psych vs Chem Psych vs Eng Psych vs Biology Psych vs Soc Math vs Soc Econ vs Soc Pol Sci vs Soc Hist vs Soc	Math vs Soc Math vs Biology Psych vs Soc Psych vs Biology Eng vs Soc Eng vs Biol Hist vs Soc Hist vs Biology			

*Ties

TABLE 4

ADMINISTRATOR DIFFERENCES AS RELATED TO AREA OF APPOINTMENT:
INDICE SCORES, F VALUES, AND p LEVELS

Indices	APPOINTMENT AREAS: Academic Affairs	Business and/or Finance	Student Affairs	Black (Minority) Affairs	F	p
Role						
Long-term minority impact	7.50	6.63	7.67	9.11	5.30	< .01
Racial Climate						
Black/White trust	9.35	10.38	8.46	7.11	7.58	< .01
Openness and inclusiveness	9.76	9.69	8.81	7.78	3.15	.03
Adm/Fac/Student Interaction	6.91	6.63	5.62	4.56	7.67	< .01
Black visibility & influence	8.71	9.38	7.52	7.00	3.60	.02
Institutional Responsiveness						
Willingness	21.53	22.88	20.15	19.00	2.90	.04
Adequacy	15.12	18.00	13.70	12.11	5.45	< .01
White commitment to Blacks	32.62	34.94	30.11	25.11	8.75	< .01
Administrative commitment	17.38	18.38	15.98	14.22	7.05	< .01
Faculty commitment	12.53	13.25	11.73	10.11	6.88	< .01
Student commitment	7.59	7.94	7.17	5.44	5.53	< .01
Institutional Impacts						
Black influence exertion	16.91	18.31	15.42	13.33	4.81	< .01
Impacts and Responses--Administrative						
Black & minority enrollment impact	4.41	3.63	4.96	6.11	3.58	.02
Black staff and program impact	13.32	8.63	12.71	16.33	6.27	< .01
Positive-negative relationships	26.91	27.62	26.12	22.33	2.69	.05
Personal openness	21.29	19.25	22.02	24.00	5.71	< .01

TABLE 5

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR COMPARISONS:
INDICES, F VALUES, AND p LEVELS

Indice	Sub Group: Administrator	Faculty	F	p
Role of Racial Minorities in CUs				
Universalistic-particularistic standard	2.25	2.72	6.03	.01
Long-tern minority impact	4.51	3.93	14.48	.02
Institutional Goals for Blacks or Racial Minorities				
Institutional black priority	28.19	26.07	16.01	< .01
Non-academic support	14.65	13.66	12.62	< .01
Affirmative Action	6.98	6.28	15.74	< .01
Integrating concern for Blacks	9.70	8.55	24.97	< .01
Institutional Responsiveness				
Adequacy	14.66	15.50	4.72	.03
Administrative Commitment	16.70	16.06	4.86	.03
Black commitment	9.04	8.58	11.25	< .01
Institutional Impacts				
Total black influence	11.83	11.21	6.11	.01
Authoritarian treatment	11.24	10.31	27.12	< .01

Table 6

ADMINISTRATIVE-FACULTY DIFFERENCES ON ROLE OF RACIAL MINORITIES ON ITEMS NOT USED IN INDICES: MEAN SCORES, t, AND p

Item*	Faculty	Administrator	t	p	Interpretation
7. Colleges and universities have an obligation to encourage racial interaction in all areas of campus life.	1.94	1.76	2.64	<.01	Administrators agree more strongly.
9. Black or ethnic studies programs should have a strong focus on activist and/or community service activities.	2.77	2.59	2.86	<.01	Administrators do not disagree as strongly.
10. Despite our concern over racial injustice, colleges and universities do not have a primary responsibility to rectify that situation.	2.71	3.0	3.97	<.01	Administrators disagree more strongly.
12. Remedial education should not be offered for academic credit.	2.03	2.33	3.74	<.01	Administrators agree less strongly.
14. Racial minority students are best served by continued stress on traditional standards of academic performance.	2.23	2.47	3.33	<.01	While both groups are split (scores near 2.5), administrators disagree a bit more.
15. In light of current and projected enrollment declines, colleges and universities should move toward open admissions.	2.85	2.65	2.64	<.01	Administrators do not disagree quite as strongly.
19. Colleges and universities should insure the inclusion of blacks and other racial minorities in faculty and administrative positions not specifically responsible for those groups.	2.01	1.75	3.81	<.01	Administrators agree more strongly.
20. Despite concern for past discrimination, hiring and promotion decisions must favor the most qualified individual in colleges and universities.	1.66	1.81	2.30	<.05	Administrators agree less strongly.

*Item numbers in all three questionnaires,